

# FISCAL NOTE

**Bill #:** HB0470

**Title:** Applicants to pay for certain environmental impact statements

**Primary Sponsor:** Clark, P

**Status:** As Amended in House Committee

Sponsor signature	Date	David Ewer, Budget Director	Date
-------------------	------	-----------------------------	------

## Fiscal Summary

	<b><u>FY 2006 Difference</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2007 Difference</u></b>
<b>Expenditures:</b>		
State Special Revenue	\$250,000	\$250,000
<b>Revenue:</b>		
State Special Revenue	\$250,000	\$250,000
<b>Net Impact on General Fund Balance:</b>	\$0	\$0

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Local Gov. Impact               | <input type="checkbox"/> Technical Concerns                       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Included in the Executive Budget | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Significant Long-Term Impacts |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dedicated Revenue Form Attached             | <input type="checkbox"/> Needs to be included in HB 2             |

## Fiscal Analysis

### ASSUMPTIONS:

#### **Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)**

1. This bill would increase revenue and expenditures by equal amounts, because it would allow the department to fully collect the expense of doing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). That is not the case under current law.
2. There will be an average of one project per fiscal year in which the applicant would not have paid the full amount were it not for this legislation. The incremental cost per project is estimated at \$250,000.
3. Without this legislation, the department would have to divert funds from other priorities to cover the cost of necessary environmental analyses.
4. The bill as amended provides that in certain circumstances the agency would pay 25 percent of the disputed costs resulting from changes during the course of an EIS. The department assumes these disputes will be rare and not expensive. Regardless of size and frequency, they will not impact revenue or expenditures. The agency will receive no additional funding for such costs, but rather will have to divert funds from other activities within its existing budget to cover this 25 percent should it occur.

**Fiscal Note Request HB0470, As Amended in House Committee**  
(continued)

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

	<u>FY 2006 Difference</u>	<u>FY 2007 Difference</u>
<u>Expenditures:</u>		
Operating Expenses	\$250,000	\$250,000
<u>Funding of Expenditures:</u>		
State Special Revenue (02)	\$250,000	\$250,000
<u>Revenues:</u>		
State Special Revenue (02)	\$250,000	\$250,000
<u>Net Impact to Fund Balance (Revenue minus Funding of Expenditures):</u>		
State Special Revenue (02)	0	0

**LONG-RANGE IMPACTS:**

A precedent was set in 2003 in which a permit applicant refused to pay the full cost of preparation of an EIS. This could result in more applicants refusing to pay more than the statutory minimum, which would require the department to divert increasing amounts of money from other priorities to cover these costs.